

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/699,510	10/31/2003	Robert H. Wollenberg	T-6298A (538-60)	3592
7590 02/16/2006			EXAMINER	
Michael E. Carmen, Esq.			WALLENHORST, MAUREEN	
M. CARMEN, ASSOCIATES, PLLC 170 Old Country Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 400			1743	
Mineola, NY 11501			DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/699,510	WOLLENBERG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Maureen M. Wallenhorst	1743	

	Maureen M. Wallennorst	1743	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		LIINGI NEFEI WAS F	ILED WITTIIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origon than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>		· ·	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	**		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		-	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none.	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wi /ided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-37</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			•
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered and necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		,,	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
·	jameer m. Wallent	m +	
γ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	MAUREEN M. WALLENHORST		
n	PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1600 1200	Maureen M. Waller Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1743	norst

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants have not filed an appropriate terminal disclaimer over application serial no. 10/699,529. In addition, Applicants' arguments are not persuasive for the reasons of record set forth in the final Office action mailed on November 4, 2005. Applicants also argue that Kolosov et al only discloses a system and method for screeing a library of a multitude of genera of material samples, one of which may be a lubricant, and a lubricant can be a grease or jelly and not necessarily a lubricating oil composition comprising a base oil and an additive. In response to this argument, Applicants are directed to paragraph nos. 0042 and 0043 in Kolosov et al where it states that the materials screened using the high throughput system and method can include gels, greases and oils, and that each of these materials may have an additive therein. The lubricant material analyzed in Kolosov et al is not limited to a grease or jelly, but rather, can be an oil with an additive therein. Since the dictionary definition of an additive is a substance added to another in relatively small amounts, it is inherent that in the teaching by Kolosov et al of lubricant oils containing an additive therein, that the additive is present in a minor amount while the base oil is present in a major amount since an additive by definition is only present in relatively small amounts compared to the substance it is added to.